

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 27, 2010 the Examiner noted that claims 8-10 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claims 8-10 have been cancelled, new claim 15 has been added, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claim 15 remains pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejection is traversed below.

New claim 15 is effectively a combination of the features of claims 8-10 with an amendment or modification to address the rejection over Arrow as discussed below.

Page 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Arrow and Christensen.

The Action states:

Arrow is directed to a packet filtering method characterized by storing filtering information for use in filtering at a receiving side in an encrypted packet to be sent to the receiving side and sending it from a sending side (col. 6 lines 46-60 shows the encryption and authentication information is added to a packet at sending side, and verified at the receiving side. In addition, col. 12 lines 35-46 show that packets are decrypted after they are authenticated, and therefore, it shows packets were encrypted.

Arrow states:

VPN units maintain lookup tables for identifying members of specific virtual private network groups. When a data packet is sent between source and destination addresses that are both members of the same VPN, the VPN unit processes the data packet from the sending side ensuring that it is compressed, if necessary, properly encrypted, that authentication information is added to it. Likewise, the receiving VPN unit servicing the destination site will detect that a packet is being propagated between members of the same VPN. The receiving VPN unit authenticates, decrypts and decompresses the packet (if necessary) before forwarding it toward the destination endstation. In this way, secure data communications between end users is achieved in a manner that is transparent to the end users.

(See Arrow, col. 5, lines 46-60)

In state 908, the system associates user ID 820 with address of remote machine 822. The system stores this association so that subsequent packets with the same user ID 820 can be checked to ensure that they originate from the same remote machine 812. If a subsequent packet with the same user ID 820 does not originate from the same address, an adversary may be attempting to pass himself off as user 810. In this case, the system takes appropriate action to deal with the potential network attack. The system next proceeds to state 910. In state 910, once the packet is authenticated, the system decrypts and, if necessary, decompresses the packet. The system next proceeds to state 912.

(See Arrow, col. 12, lines 35-

That is, the Action looks to the packet encryption of Arrow and asserts that Arrow teaches that

because the filter information is in the packet the filter information is encrypted

Claim 15 states:

a packet transmitting apparatus, at a sending side, to provide a filter key for identifying a specific value of showing a VoIP performing a VoIP communication, bury the provided filter key in an IPv6 extended header added to an IPv6 header or in a flow label region in an IPv6 header or the transferred packet to prevent the filter key from being encrypted by an IPsec and transmit the packet with the filter key to a receiving side

That is, claim 15 makes it clear that the packet transmitting apparatus or transmitter does not encrypt the filter key ("prevent the filter key from being encrypted") and the packet is transmitted with the unencrypted filter key ("transmit the packet with the filter key to a receiving side").

The receiver ("a packet receiving apparatus") recited in claim 1 also uses language consistent with a transmitter receiving packets from a receiver that does not encrypt the filter key.

Christensen is asserted for its alleged high priority packet process features.

It is submitted that claim 15 is not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3/28/11

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501